Case3:11-cv-03847-JCS Document87-2 Filed07/16/12 Page1 of 4

1	James Isbester (State Bar No. 129820) G. Ross Allen (State Bar No. 262968)	_
2	KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LI 1080 Marsh Road	LP
3	Menlo Park, CA 94025 Telephone: (650) 326-2400	
4	Facsimile: (650) 326-2422 Email: grallen@kilpatricktownsend.com	
5	Michael D. Switzer (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)	
6	Brian C. Bianco (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) Alissa R. Misun (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)	
7	Peter G. Hawkins (<i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) ULMER & BERNE LLP	
8	500 West Madison Street Suite 3600	
9	Chicago, IL 60661-4587 Telephone: (312) 658-6500	
10	Facsimile: (312) 658-6501 Email: mswitzer@ulmer.com	
11	Email: bbianco@ulmer.com Email: amisun@ulmer.com	
12	Email: phawkins@ulmer.com	
13	Attorneys for Defendant Renesas Electronics America Inc.	
14		
15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
16	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
17	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
18	GRAIL SEMICONDUCTOR,	Case No. 3:11-CV-03847-JCS
19	Plaintiff,	Magistrate Judge Joseph C. Spero
20	V.	HAWKINS DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT RENESAS ELECTRONICS AMERICA INC.'S MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF TO FILE A SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF IN
21	RENESAS ELECTRONICS AMERICA INC.,	
22	Defendant.	
23		SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO LOCAL
24		RULE 7-11
25		
26		
27		
28	HAWKINS DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT INC.'S MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF TO I	FILE A SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY

CASE NO. 3:11-CV-03847-JCS

9

12 13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

I, Peter G. Hawkins, hereby declare as follows:

- 1. I am an attorney admitted to practice in the State of Illinois, and I have been admitted to practice in the Northern District of California on a pro hac vice basis, representing Defendant Renesas Electronics America Inc. ("REA"). I have personal knowledge of the material facts stated herein, and I submit this Declaration in support of REA's 's Motion for Administrative Relief to File a Supplemental Reply Brief in Support of its Motion to Dismiss ("REA's Motion for Admin Relief"). If called to testify, I could and would testify to the facts as set forth herein.
- 2. On July 11, 2012 counsel for REA contacted counsel for Plaintiff Grail Semiconductor ("Grail") and inquired as to whether counsel for Grail would stipulate to REA's Motion for Admin Relief.
- 3. On July 12, 2012 counsel for Grail contacted counsel for REA and indicated they would oppose REA's Motion for Admin Relief.
- Exhibit A to REA's Motion for Admin Relief is a true and correct copy of July 11th, 2012 and Jul 12th, 2012 email correspondence between A. Pohlman of Ulmer & Berne LLP and G. Opatken of Niro, Haller & Niro, Ltd.
- 5. Exhibit B to REA's Motion for Admin Relief is a true and correct copy of REA's Supplemental Reply Brief in Support of its Motion to Dismiss ("Supplemental Reply"), portions of which in accordance with Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, has been lodged with the Court under Administration Motion for the Courts permission to file under seal.
- 6. Exhibit C to REA's Motion for Admin Relief is a true and correct copy of a timeline outlining Grail's delay of the Court-ordered limited discovery period. This document is prepared from correspondence and other documents exchanged between counsel for REA and counsel for Grail. REA is ready, willing, and able to produce the documents underlying this exhibit at the Court's request.
- 7. Exhibit D to REA's Motion for Admin Relief is a true and correct copy of correspondence dated March 30, 2012 exchanged between C. Lee of Niro, Haller & Niro and

2

8.

9.

8

10

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

24

23

25

26

14.

CASE NO. 3:11-CV-03847-JCS

27

28 HAWKINS DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT RENESAS ELECTRONICS AMERICA INC.'S MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF TO FILE A SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 7-11

Exhibit 2 to REA's Motion for Admin Relief is also Exhibit 2 to REA's

Supplemental Reply and is also Exhibit 59 to the July 10th, 2012 Deposition of Donald Stern and is a true and correct copy of the complaint, with exhibits, in the litigation titled *Donald S. Stern v.* TEC Software Telecom (Israel), et al., Case No. Cv-98-21262 (RM-PVT), filed December 22nd,

Supplemental Reply and was designated as Highly Confidential – Attorney's Eyes Only and

therefore in accordance with Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, has been lodged with the Court under

Exhibit 1 to REA's Motion for Admin Relief is also Exhibit 1 to REA's

1998 in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California.

Administration Motion for the Courts permission to file under seal.

- 10. Exhibit 3 to REA's Motion for Admin Relief is also Exhibit 3 to REA's Supplemental Reply and was designated as Confidential and therefore in accordance with Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, has been lodged with the Court under Administration Motion for the Courts permission to file under seal.
- 11. Exhibit 4 to REA's Motion for Admin Relief is also Exhibit 4 to REA's Supplemental Reply and is a true and correct copy of a report from the Israeli Ministry of Justice website detailing information regarding the Israeli company, Powergate Ltd.
- 12. Exhibit 5 to REA's Motion for Admin Relief is also Exhibit 5 to REA's Supplemental Reply and is a true and correct copy of excerpts of the March 1st, 2012 Deposition of Robert Stern.
- 13. Exhibit 6 to REA's Motion for Admin Relief is also Exhibit 6 to REA's Supplemental Reply and is a true and correct copy of excerpts of the Rough Transcript of the April 23, 2012 Trial Testimony of Donald Stern in the litigation Grail Semiconductor v. Mitsubishi Electric & Electronics USA, 1-07-cv-098590, Santa Clara County Superior Court (San Jose, CA).

Exhibit 7 to REA's Motion for Admin Relief is also Exhibit 7 to REA's

Supplemental Reply and is also Exhibit 63 to the July 10th, 2012 Deposition of Donald Stern and